DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 524 EA 029 489

AUTHOR Fox, Cheryl L.
TITLE The Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model, Michigan Department of Education.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Education; *Mixed Age Grouping; Models; Needs Assessment; Program Development; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Michigan

ABSTRACT

In 1993, the Michigan legislature passed a bill that allowed school districts to adopt early elementary school program initiatives. These initiatives established nongraded, continuous progress programs for grades 1 through 4. An overview of how the state coordinator helped school districts implement this multiage, nongraded model is presented in this paper. Implementation entailed the creation of a three-part technical assistance model, which included a series of workshops that provide an overview of the multiage/nongraded classroom model. Implementation also focused on needs assessment for those interested in this model and helped those who were interested to develop a plan of action. Efforts to offer more professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators, and parents, and the organization of a national conference on multiage education are described. Some of the highlights include critical attributes of the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model; the positive influence on the advancement of multiage education in Michigan, such as instructional leadership, funding, teacher beliefs, and parent/community involvement; and negative consequences of multiage education, such as the need for professional development funding and more planning time. Appended is a copy of Michigan's grant guidelines for establishing nongraded continuous-progress programs for students. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 425 524

American Education Research Association
Annual Meeting
San Diego, California

April 17, 1998

The Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model
Michigan Department of Education

Cheryl L. Fox
Education Consultant

EA 029 489

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

C. Fox

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

INITIAL STATE LEVEL PLANNING

Part I
1993-95

Initial encouragement for nongraded education began in the State of Michigan through the 87th Legislature in December of 1993. Section 1278.4 of the Enrolled House Bill No. 5121 stated, *"Consistent with its core academic curriculum for early elementary school, the board of a school district shall consider adopting early elementary school program initiatives establishing nongraded, continuous progress programs for grades 1 through 4, utilizing individualized planning, maintaining comprehensive portfolios and narrative reports of learning progress for all pupils, and emphasizing collegiality and collaboration among teachers, parents and students all over multiple year periods"*. The wording of this legislation is important to the Michigan multiage initiative. The words "shall consider adopting" specifically gives districts the *choice* in moving toward the nongraded model. The Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model is a *"choice model."* A choice for parents and students as well as teachers.

On May 11, 1994 the State Board of Education met and approved funding in the form of Chapter 2 ESEA, Elementary Targeted Assistance Grants - Multiage Nongraded Programs. This new State funding initiative encouraged the establishment of learner-centered nongraded continuous progress model classrooms for the elementary level. Grant funds totaling $300,000 were made available to public elementary schools and teachers within a local or intermediate school district to assist with the implementation or expansion of a multiage nongraded classroom for the 1994-95 school year. The Department of Education received 171 applications, representing 111 school districts, requesting more than $1.5 million for implementation and dissemination activities during the 1994-95 school year. Attached is a copy of the grant program criteria. (Attachment 1)

The legislation, funding, and overwhelming response from school districts requesting funds and technical assistance in the implementation and/or expansion of multiage models, compelled the Department of Education to hire an education consultant to coordinate the State's

early efforts in supporting the multiage nongraded model. In July of 1995, I accepted the position as State Coordinator/Education Consultant for the Multiage Continuous Progress Model. My initial assignment at the Department of Education was to design a strategic plan for the exploration, implementation and/or expansion of multiage continuous progress classroom. Based upon my training and expertise in the systems thinking model, my knowledge and experience in the school improvement process and research gathered on multiage education, I began to design a guided process or model for all public school districts throughout our State. My focus, based upon research, extensive communications and observations from other states implementing multiage continuous progress models, national experts in the field of multiage education, and my own experience in leading a local school district through the process of implementation, led me to create a three-part technical assistance model for the State. The guided support model is titled, **Multiage Continuous Progress Programs: A Series of How to Get Started Workshops.** (See attachment 2) The first workshop, ***Awareness,*** provides an overview of the multiage/nongraded classroom model with current research being supplied to the participants to assist in looking systemically at this organizational change. The second session, ***District/Building Needs Assessment,*** focuses on conducting a needs assessment for those interested in moving toward implementation or expanding their current multiage model. Participants are provided the ***School Program Study Guide - The Multiage Classroom***, a tool designed to assist the building in evaluating the learning environment, developmentally appropriate practices, assessment methods, and educational partnerships critical for successful implementation. Finally, in session three, I guide the participants in ***Developing a Plan of Action***. A visual tracking system is used which enables participants to establish a time line, determine specific tasks in order to achieve outcomes, discuss methods to secure parent/community involvement, research developmentally appropriate practices and materials as well as to determine program evaluation. The model has proven extremely successful for our State. In the past three years as coordinator, I have spoken to over 15,000 teachers, administrators, parents and community members interested in exploring or expanding upon their multiage model.

Another facet of the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model was the formation of a multiage referent committee at the State Department of Education. The committee members consisted of administrators, teachers, parents and department staff. The major roles and responsibilities of this committee are:

1) Survey and speak for the group he/she represents

2) Contribute experience and expertise as related to the multiage model

3) Assist the committee to make balanced educational decisions

The group met regularly for the initial two years of the project and formulated the *designing principles* of the multiage model for the State of Michigan and consulted with key State Department staff on issues relating to multiage education.

Part II
1995-96

The 1995-96 school year began with another Chapter 2, ESEA Elementary Targeted Assistance Grant program focusing again on the establishment of nongraded continuous progress programs. During 1995-96, grants not exceeding a total of $200,000 were available for programs addressing multiage education. The grants were awarded by a competitive application process. The Department of Education received 113 applications requesting $980,000 for implementation and dissemination activities during the 1995-96 school year. In January, it became apparent that there was an urgent need to provide additional professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators and parents. I addressed this issue by designing and administering three regional summer technical assistance conferences held throughout the State of Michigan. Each regional conference featured a national expert in multiage education. The break-out sessions were comprised of teacher/administrator/parent teams from around our State who were in different stages of implementing multiage education in their respective districts. The conferences were a tremendous success. The participants not only were able to gain valuable information on the multiage model, but equally as important was the opportunity to network and share ideas and strategies with other teacher teams from our State.

Beginning the 1996-97 school year was a challenge for the multiage initiative due to lack of any type of financial incentives from the Department of Education such as was previously given over the past two years. Most school districts throughout the State of Michigan began exploring alternative funding sources for multiage implementation or expansion. Title I and Goals 2000 monies were now being used to support the initiatives in most districts throughout the State.

In December of 1996, the first State Conference on Multiage Education was held in Lansing, Michigan. Sponsored by the Michigan Department of Education and administered by the Michigan Institute for Educational Management (MIEM), a private organization which specializes in organizing high quality professional development conferences. The conference featured Jon Tapper, a national expert and teacher of multiage education from Vermont. In addition to the

featured keynote, exemplary multiage classroom models highlighted the breakout sessions. By recognizing exemplary Michigan model classrooms, we not only provided an opportunity for all in attendance to learn more about the model, it enabled teachers and administrators to collaborate and expand upon their already growing resource network of multiage educators in the State.

Part III
1997-Present

Throughout the 1996-97 school year I continued to provide technical assistance through my three-part workshop series and began informal monitoring of multiage sites around the State. In the Spring, I received a request from one of our Regional Education Service Areas in Kalamazoo seeking my assistance in organizing a summer conference for Kalamazoo County. (The Kalamazoo RESA had received some grant monies out of a Goals 2000 grant specifically targeted at multiage education). The professional development staff at Kalamazoo RESA and I began planning a summer conference. During this planning period I contacted some of my national colleagues in the field of multiage education and discussed the possibility of presenting at this local county-wide conference. My colleagues encouraged me and the staff at Kalamazoo RESA to host a *National* Multiage Conference instead of the planned county-wide conference. After a brief discussion and presentation to the board of directors at Kalamazoo RESA, the National Conference was approved. We now had only nine months to plan, organize, and orchestrate this event. On August 14, 15, & 16, 1997 the National Multiage Continuous Progress Model Conference was held in Kalamazoo, Michigan. We had 1000 people in attendance from all over the world. Barbara Pavan, Robert Anderson, Alfie Kohn, Susan Kovalik, and Richard Sagor were the keynoters. The break-out sessions were organized by strands: Philosophy/Theory, Developmentally Appropriate Practices, Teaming/Change Process, Assessment/Reporting, Integrating Curriculum/Technology, Models, Brain Research/Multiple Intelligences/Learning Styles. The first year of the National Conference in Michigan was a success. We are currently planning this year's conference to be held on August 13, 14 & 15th in Kalamazoo.

In addition to the National Conference held in August of 1997, two regional conferences were also organized and well attended. One in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan - Marquette and the other in the northern part of the Lower Peninsula - Petoskey. These two regional conferences were created mainly to continue to support the efforts of the educators in this region of our State who may or may not have been able to attend the National Conference in Kalamazoo. As in the

previous year, each conference had a national keynote speaker on multiage education. Peggy Dorta, Vermont's Multiage Teacher of the Year presented in Marquette, and Elizabeth Lolli, a national expert in multiage curriculum design and assessment, presented in Petoskey. The conferences were funded from a combination of existing grant monies and through conference registrations. The Michigan Department of Education co-sponsored the National Multiage Conference along with the North Central Regional Education Laboratory (NCREL) Oakbrook, Illinois. The Michigan Department of Education also co-sponsored the two regional conferences held throughout the State.

In December 1997, the 2nd Annual State Multiage Conference was held in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The keynote address was given by Anne Davies, an international expert from British Columbia on assessment in the multiage classroom. The break-out sessions consisted again of exemplary multiage classroom model teams from around the State as well as educational consultants presenting on various topics relating to multiage education.

Currently, the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model continues to grow with preschool through middle school sites throughout the state. My primary responsibilities include: providing technical assistance to schools; planning regional, state and the National Multiage Continuous Progress Model conferences; monitoring and evaluating classrooms; presenting at State and National conferences; serving on numerous Department of Education committees which relate to the multiage initiative and also serving as a liaison between the Department of Education and major Michigan universities throughout our State.

Critical Attributes of the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model

The critical attributes of the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress classroom were based upon research and established by the Michigan Department of Education's Multiage Referent Committee. These "Designing Principles" or essential elements of an "authentic" multiage classroom include:

1. **Multiage/Multiability/Multiyear classrooms** - Learners of various ages and abilities work and learn together in developmentally appropriate environment. Learners spend multiple years with the same classmates and teaching team.

2. **Continuous Progress** - Learners continuously progress through the curriculum at their own rate and level, achieving identified standards.

3. **Developmentally Appropriate Practices** - The curriculum is learner centered designed to develop the learner's knowledge and skills in all developmental areas.

4. **Professional Teamwork** - Teacher teams (2 or more) work together to plan, deliver, instruct and assess the learner and the curriculum.

5. **Authentic Assessment and Evaluation** - Instruction and assessment reflect current knowledge of effective teaching and learning practices. Ongoing assessment, tied to instruction employs a variety of methods to support continuous learner progress.

6. **Qualitative Reporting** - Systems reflect the continuous progress and development of each child in all developmental areas; physical, social, emotional and intellectual.

7. **Parent Involvement** - Parental involvement is encouraged in all aspects of the multiage learning environment. Teachers view parents as "educational partners" in the educational process.

Positive Influences on the Advancement of Multiage Education in Michigan

Factors that contributed the most positively to the advancement of the multiage educational model in the State of Michigan were: *Choice Model, Instructional Leadership (State And Local Levels), Funding, Teacher Beliefs, Parent/Community Involvement.*

Choice Model - The wording in the initial legislation "shall consider adopting" created a safe environment for exploring the multiage model. The State did not mandate implementation, thus creating a conducive environment for change. Since the initial legislation was written in 1993, however, the State Board of Education (December of 1996) reviewed and edited the school code and eliminated this section encouraging the establishment of nongraded, continuous progress programs. In spite of this action, districts across the state continue to explore and implement multiage classrooms. Three years ago the Department of Education estimated there were about 130 districts (out of 597) implementing the multiage model. Today we estimate there are close to 300 districts across the State beginning or expanding upon their models. I believe this is primarily due to the *"choice"* model of implementing the multiage continuous progress model.

Instructional Leadership - Developing a strategic plan at the State and local level was an integral part of the success of the multiage initiative in Michigan. The technical assistance offered by the Department of Education in the form of three process guided workshops effectively communicated the critical attributes of authentic multiage classroom models. It also assisted the local districts in articulating a clear and focused mission/vision. This was accomplished through self-evaluation (School Program Study Guide) and by developing a step by step plan of action collaboratively with teachers, administrators and parents thus increasing ownership and commitment to the project. In addition, at the local level, many principals and central office administrators collaborated with the Department of Education in promoting multiage education throughout the State. This was achieved through serving on the Department of Education's Referent Committee, presenting at regional and state conferences, and creating a support network for other administrators within the state who were in the process of leading their learning community through the exploration of the multiage model.

Funding - Initially there were two Targeted Assistance Grants to encourage the establishment of learner-centered nongraded continuous progress model classrooms. These grants provided the districts with minimal funding ($1,500. per teacher). However, it did demonstrate the Department of Education's commitment to the project.

Teacher Beliefs - In effective schools there is a climate of expectation in which staff believes and demonstrates that all students can attain mastery of the essential school skills and staff *believe* that they have the capability to help all students attain mastery. (Lezotte 1996) The philosophy of the nongraded classroom is based upon the premise that *"All children can learn,"* the teachers and administrators who truly embrace the multiage continuous progress model's philosophy in our State demonstrate this belief daily. Creating the collaborative regional and state conferences encouraged educators to share their knowledge, expertise and *beliefs* on multiage education with their colleagues. As a result, more and more educators began to explore the multiage model for their own building or district. Collaboration and collegiality were truly positive influences for the development of the multiage continuous progress classroom.

Parent/Community Involvement - A critical element to the success of the multiage model in our State was the parent/community involvement component. Districts were encouraged through the technical assistance training offered by the Department of Education to establish parent/community, school, central office partnerships, study groups or task forces in order to study and discuss the research on multiage education, and conduct site visitations for all to gain a better understanding of the model before implementing. The benefit of this early parental involvement provided the educators with the support needed to successfully implement the model. Giving parents the opportunity to be involved in the planning and development of the district's multiage continuous progress model philosophy created a climate of trust, collaboration and support critical in helping the school achieve it's mission.

Negative Influences on the Advancement of Multiage Education in Michigan

Factors that contribute negatively toward the advancement of multiage education in Michigan include the following: *Professional development funding for teacher training; Inadequate time for teacher planning; Community members who have not been educated about the model; Teaching staff who do not want to change; lack of district or school leadership for the model.*

Professional development funding - Staff development needs to be an ongoing process and is an essential element to the implementation and/or expansion of the multiage model. Unfortunately, in 1993 the professional development funding for our State was cut dramatically. Consequently, many districts were unable to provide adequate professional development programs for their staff. Districts must now apply for competitive grants either from Goals 2000 or Eisenhower funds to provide appropriate training for their staff.

Teacher Planning Time - Due to the lack of funding for professional development, many districts are unable to provide the time necessary for teachers to plan for their multiage classroom. Teachers need blocks of time to plan an integrated thematic curriculum, locate instructional tools for teaching and assessment, etc... School administrators around the state struggle with this problem on a daily basis.

Teaching Staff who do not want to change - In Michigan, because the multiage continuous progress model is a choice model, the majority our school districts have offered a choice for parents of a single-graded classroom model or a multiage classroom model, within the same school building. Staff education, collegiality, collaboration and respect for each others beliefs is essential for the success of either model. Too often teachers who do not want to change to the multiage model can sabotage the efforts of the multiage staff. Including all staff members in the process of restructuring is critical for the success of the school.

District/School leadership - Many times I have observed teachers in a school district become excited about the multiage continuous progress model and express a desire to begin immediately. District and school advocacy and leadership must be part of these teacher's vision, otherwise they can set themselves up for failure. Teachers need an effective leader to support and persistently communicate the mission of the multiage model to other staff members, parents and community members. If not a lot of time and energy may be wasted on planning a multiage classroom that may never come into existence.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although the Michigan Multiage Continuous Progress Model is relatively new in terms of total years of implementation, the model is continuing to grow and flourish in all parts of our State. I attribute the steady growth of this model to many variables including:

- Initial State level legislation, leadership and funding, encouraging districts to explore the model.

- The Michigan Department of Education's Multiage referent committee's establishment of the "Designing Principles" or essential elements of an authentic multiage classroom.

- A State level guided process model designed to enable districts to study the research, conduct a self assessment program evaluation, needs assessment to determine materials, pedagogical options for teaching and assessment, and personnel requirements, and the use of a "plan board" for systemic program development.

- An active multiage referent committee comprised of teachers, administrators, parents, and State Department staff to survey, contribute experience and expertise as related to the multiage model.

- The coordination and collaboration of Department of Education staff, Intermediate School District personnel, University consultants, school administrators, teachers, and parents, to design and orchestrate local, regional, statewide and The National Multiage Continuous Progress Conference.

Finally, the dedication, hard work, and the beliefs from all educators involved in restructuring their school to a multiage continuous progress model has truly been remarkable. Thousands of children in the State of Michigan have already benefitted from the commitment of educators who have implemented the multiage continuous progress model and believe "All Children Can Learn." The challenge for those educators in the future will be to sustain their efforts in the shadow of reduced funding for professional development and planning, State mandated testing/funding, rigid district grade level curriculum, constant changes in district and/or school leaders, colleagues who do not support the multiage model, and community members who have difficulty in accepting changes in our schools.

EXHIBIT D

Michigan Department of Education
Office of Grants and Technology

1994-95 CHAPTER 2, ESEA, ELEMENTARY TARGETED ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION

The Michigan State Board of Education is pleased to announce a new grant initiative in 1994-95, under the Chapter 2, ESEA, Elementary Targeted Assistance Grant Program. This initiative focuses on the establishment of non-graded continuous progress programs for students in multi-age classrooms. Such programs will incorporate a learner-centered philosophy, maintain comprehensive student portfolios and individualized learning progress reports, and emphasize cooperation and collaboration among teachers, parents and students. During 1994-95, grants not exceeding a total of $300,000 will be available for programs addressing this need. The grants will be awarded by competitive application process.

PROGRAM SUPPORT

The Elementary Targeted Assistance Grant Program supplements existing local, state, and federally funded efforts which encourage school districts to adopt innovative elementary school improvement initiatives. The multi-age non-graded continuous progress program is an innovative approach to instruction which is based upon an innovative curriculum that enables students to work together in a non-competitive environment that encourages mutual respect and exchange of ideas. This model provides opportunities for all children to succeed, enabling them to make continuous progress toward the achievement of curricular outcomes unimpeded by age or school calendar. Two types of grants will be provided for activities in 1994-95 which support a multi-age non-graded continuous progress approach for students in grades K through 5. The intent of this funding is to provide seed monies to encourage as many new programs as possible and to assist with implementation costs.

1. PROGRAM MODEL IMPLEMENTATION

Grants of $1,500 per participating teacher will be provided to assist elementary school programs in the implementation or expansion of learner-centered multi-age non-graded classrooms in 1994-95. Such classrooms would include a variety of grade levels such as: grades K, 1, and 2; grades 3, 4 and 5; and other combinations. The non-graded classroom would provide for a continuum of curriculum where students of varying ages and abilities are encouraged and provided the flexibility to advance at the pace at which they are achieving. The classroom could be multi-age in a single curriculum area, or in the full range of curricular areas. This approach would involve teams of teachers and others working with individual students or groups of students, including peer modeling. Instructional grouping could take place within and between classes based on thematic units, achievement, interest or other means and would therefore, be dynamic.

Activities supported under this initiative might include, for example, professional development and training for instructional staff, collaborative activities for teachers and parents, activities pertaining to the development of appropriate measurement and instructional

support systems, site visits to school districts where learner-centered multi-age classrooms are operating successfully, as well as supplementary classroom and instructional materials and learning aids. All programs funded under this initiative will be expected to be implemented during the 1994-95 school year.

2. MODEL PROGRAM DISSEMINATION

In 1994-95, a limited number of grants will be provided for the dissemination of model elementary school programs which are currently implementing a multi-age non-graded continuous progress approach. Model programs will be expected to develop descriptive materials regarding the successful program and to package and disseminate the information for use by interested districts. The maximum grant award amount for these activities is $5,000.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Elementary school buildings within a local or intermediate school district are eligible to apply for these funds. A separate application must be developed and submitted for each participating school building within the district, reflecting ownership and coordination with the district's school improvement plan.

SELECTION CRITERIA

All applicants for these funds must address the following requirements within their narrative proposal. Applicants for Model Program Dissemination grants should address each area relative to what has been implemented and shown to be effective. Each criterion will be rated on a scale of 1 to 10. The maximum possible points is 100.

1. Planning and Preparation

Describe the planning and activities that have occurred in readiness and preparation for implementation of the multi-age non-graded continuous progress model, including training for instructional staff, parent and community orientation, and administrative support.

2. Curriculum

Describe the curriculum that has been developed to implement the non-graded concept.

3. Non-graded

Describe how the multi-age program will be implemented to reflect a non-graded approach.

4. Continuous Progress

Describe the instructional approach so that students will be able to progress along a continuum of objectives throughout the school year.

5. Instructional Program

Describe how the instructional program will be implemented for individual students.

6. Monitoring of the Program and Measuring Student Progress

Describe how the program will be monitored to assure that all students are making continuous progress and achieving the specified learner outcomes.

7. Student Portfolios

Describe how student portfolios will be used, the criteria for determining the content of student portfolios and rating portfolio work, and who will select the student work to go into the portfolio.

8. Support Systems for the Teacher

Describe the support systems to assist the instructional staff in identifying the most productive curricular and instructional combinations given the multi-age span and achievement levels of the students.

9. Professional Development

Describe the professional development plan for effective implementation of the multi-age non-graded continuous progress program and its relationship to the district's school improvement plan.

10. Costs

Describe how the funds will be used.

REVIEW PROCESS

All applications will be reviewed and rated in accordance with the established criteria by professional staff of the Department of Education. Funding will be subject to approval by the State Board of Education. In addition to the selection criteria above, the State Board of Education may apply other factors in making decisions to fund proposals, such as: (a) duplication of effort; (b) duplication of funding; (c) geographical distribution; and (d) evidence that an applicant has not performed satisfactorily on previous projects.

USE OF THE FUNDS

Grant funds provided under this initiative may be used for the following purposes:

Program Model Implementation:

1. Professional development activities to implement the multi-age non-graded continuous progress program, including activities focused on the development of instructional support systems, monitoring student progress, portfolio assessment, techniques of managing different groups at multiple levels and subject matters, and other areas integral to the concept of multi-age non-graded continuous progress programs.

2. Site visits to schools that are successfully operating multi-age non-graded continuous progress programs.

3. Supplementary classroom and instructional materials and learning aids.

4. Other appropriate expenditures.

Model Program Dissemination:

1. Development, printing and dissemination of descriptive materials regarding the successful model.

2. Other appropriate expenditures.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

All programs funded under this initiative are required to develop an evaluation plan to determine the effectiveness of the proposed program. Such plans should include assessment of pupils' learning of academic core curricular outcomes, as measured by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) or other criterion-referenced assessments. A final evaluation report will be required within 60 calendar days of the ending date of the grant, or no later than November 30, 1995.

LENGTH OF AWARDS

Funding will be for the fiscal year 1994-95 with an effective date following State Board of Education approval of the grants, anticipated at the August 1994 meeting, and an ending date of September 30, 1995.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

Federal law requires that constituent non-public schools must be provided the opportunity to participate in projects supported by this program on an equitable basis.

Multiage Continuous Progress Programs
A Series of How to Get Started Workshops

How To Get Started!

Cheryl L. Fox, Michigan Department of Education

What **are multiage continuous progress classrooms?**

What **does research say about these programs?**

How **do you successfully start a multiage continuous progress classroom?**

How **do they fit Michigan's education legislation?**

If you are planning or beginning a multiage continuous progress program, you will want to attend these sessions. You will learn how to identify an authentic multiage program, review current research, assemble the key components of a multiage classroom, and develop a plan of action for your own district.

Presenter:
Cheryl L. Fox
Michigan Department of Education
Education Consultant

Cheryl's experience includes seventeen years in the field of education in both general and special education early childhood programs. She initiated and led her own district (West Ottawa) in the implementation of multiage nongraded programs and served on the Department of Education's Multiage Task Force Committee.

A Series of Three Sessions:

Session 1 - Awareness
Session 2 - District/Building Needs Assessment
Session 3 - Developing a Plan of Action

Session 1
Awareness

This session will provide an overview of the multiage/nongraded classroom with current research being supplied to assist participants in looking systemically at this organizational change.

Session 2
District/Building Needs Assessment

This session will focus on conducting a district/building needs assessment for those interested in moving toward implementing a multiage nongraded program. Participants will be provided with the *School Program Study Guide - The Multiage Classroom*, a tool designed to assist the district in evaluating: The Learning Environment, Developmentally Appropriate Practices, Assessment Methods, and Educational Partnerships.

Session 3
Developing a Plan of Action

This session will focus on developing a *Plan of Action*. Participants will establishing a time line, determine specific tasks in order to achieve outcomes, discuss methods to secure parent/community involvement, research developmentally appropriate practices and materials as well as methods to determine program evaluation.

Mac.WP:Flier 11-97

1997

Multi *AGE*

1998

Continuous Progress Programs

A Series Of
How To Get Started
Workshops

Cheryl L. Fox

Education Consultant

Michigan Department of Education

The Multiage/Nongraded Primary Bibliography

1. American Association of School Administrators. *The Nongraded Primary: Making Schools Fit Children.* Arlington, VA, 1992.

2. Anderson, Robert H., and Pavan, Barbara Nelson. *Nongradedness: Helping It to Happen.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Press, 1992.

3. Bridge, Connie A.; Reitsma, Beverly S.; and Winograd, Peter N. *Primary Thoughts: Implementing Kentucky's Primary Program.* Lexington, KY: Kentucky Department of Education, 1993.

4. Chase, Penelle, and Doan, Joan. *Full Circle: Re-envisioning Multi-age Education.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1994.

5. Chase, Penelle, *Choosing to Learn Ownership and Responsibility in a Primary Multiage Classroom,* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996.

6. Davies, Anne, Cameron, Caren, Politano, Colleen, Gregory, Kathleen. *Together is Better.* Winnipeg, MB Canada, Peguis Publishers, 1992.

7. Davies, Anne & Politano, Colleen. *Multi-Age and More.* Winnipeg, MB Canada, Peguis Publishers, 1994.

8. Fogarty, Robin, ed. *The Multiage Classroom: A Collection.* Palatine, IL: Skylight Publishing, 1993.

9. Gayfer, Margaret, ed. *The Multi-grade Classroom: Myth and Reality.* Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1991.

10. Gaustad, Joan. "Making the Transition from Graded to Nongraded Primary Education." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 35(8), 1992.

11. "Nongraded Education: Mixed-Age, Integrated and Developmentally Appropriate Education for Primary Children." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 35(7), 1992.

12. Goodlad, John I., and Anderson, Robert H. *The Nongraded Elementary School.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1987.

13. Gutierrez, Roberto, and Slavin, Robert E. *Achievement Effects of the Nongraded Elementary School: A Retrospective Review.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, 1992.

14. Hunter, Madeline. *How to Change to a Nongraded School.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992.

15. Kasten, Wendy, and Clarke, Barbara. *The Multi-age Classroom.* Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1993.6

16. Katz, Lilian G.; Evangelou, Demetra; and Hartman, Jeanette Allison.*The Case or Mixed-Age Grouping in Early Education.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1990.

17. Kentucky Department of Education. *Kentucky's Primary School: The Wonder Years.* Frankfort, KY.

18. Kentucky Education Association and Appalachia Educational Laboratory. *Ungraded Primary Programs: Steps Toward Developmentally Appropriate Instruction.* Frankfort, KY: KEA, 1990.

19. Maeda, Bev. *The Multi-Age Classroom.* Cypress, CA: Creative Teaching Press, 1994.

20. Manitoba Department of Education. *Language Arts Handbook for Primary Teachers in Multigrade Classrooms.* Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1988.

21. Miller, Bruce A. *The Multigrade Classroom: A Resource Handbook for Small, Rural Schools.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1989.

22. *Training Guide for the Multigrade Classroom: A Resource for Small, Rural Schools.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990.

23. *Keeping Children at the Center: Implementing the Multiage Classroom.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1994.

24. Province of British Columbia Ministry of Education. *Foundation.* Victoria, British Columbia, 1990. (Entries 21-24 available from Crown Publications, see resources.)

25. *Our Primary Program: Taking the Pulse.* Victoria, British Columbia, 1990.

26. *Primary Program Foundation Document..* Victoria, British Columbia, 1990.

27. *Primary Program Resource Document..* Victoria, British Columbia, 1990.

28. Rathbone, Charles; Bingham, Anne; Dorta, Peggy; McClaskey, Molly; and O'Keefe, Justine. *Multiage Portraits:Teaching and Learning in Mixed-age Classrooms.* Peterborough, NH: Crystal Springs Books, 1993.

29. Society For Developmental Education. *The Multiage, Ungraded Continuous Progress School: The Lake George Model.* Peterborough, NH: 1992.

30. *Multiage Classrooms: The Ungrading of America's Schools.* Peterborough, NH, 1993.

31. Tomlinson, Carol Ann. *How To Differentiate Instruction In Mixed Ability Classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1995.

32. Virginia Education Association and Appalachia Educational Laboratory. *Teaching Combined Grade Classes: Real Problems and Promising Practices.* Charleston, WV: AEL, 1990.

33. *The Primary Program: Growing and Learning in the Heartland.* Office of Child Development, Nebraska Dept. of Education, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, NE 68509-4987. Ph: (402) 471-3184